

**Attached is
Additional Information
for
Agenda Item #39**

**First of Two Public Hearings on the Chapter 163
Development Agreement for Fallschase**

Board of County Commissioners Meeting of Tuesday, October 25, 2005

This document distributed: October 24, 2005



Florida Department of Transportation

JEB BUSH
GOVERNOR

Post Office Box 607
1074 Highway 90
Chipley, Florida 32428-0607

DENVER J. STUTLER, JR.
SECRETARY

Planning Department
October 18, 2005

Mr. Herbert W.A. Thiele, County Attorney
County Attorney's Office
301 South Monroe Street, Suite 202
Leon County Courthouse
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Re: Fallschase DRI - Tallahassee, FL
Review of the Draft Traffic Assessment

RECEIVED
05 OCT 24 AM 11:34
LEON COUNTY
ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

Dear Mr. Thiele:

We have received the September 28, 2005 DRAFT Traffic Assessment Memorandum for the Fallschase Development of Regional Impact (DRI). The Fallschase DRI is located in Tallahassee, Florida. In general, the Applicant's submittal is a draft document, and a final report has not been submitted to FDOT for formal review.

Based on our review of this draft document, we have the following comments:

General

- The Applicant has proposed changes to several components of the vested development: (1) significant revisions to the size and composition of commercial/office space and residential units, (2) changes in the proposed location of key land uses, the introduction of new proposed land use types, the use of additional land for development, and changes to access driveway locations and overall traffic patterns. It is the Department's position that the Applicant should re-evaluate the traffic impacts to the adjacent roadway system using standard transportation engineering and planning methodologies approved by the affected governmental agencies. As agreed with the Applicant several months ago, since the beginning of the NOPC process, the Department has yet to received a proposed methodology statement to address any land use changes.
- Until an agreement is reached between the Applicant and affected governmental agencies regarding the type and intensity of development which is considered vested, a formal review of submitted documentation cannot be accomplished by the FDOT.
- The submitted DRAFT Traffic Assessment is an incomplete document, which is missing standard traffic impact study content, and does not follow the common professional practice for recommending proposed traffic operational improvements.

Analysis

- The fitted curve equation for the General Office (ITE Code 710) is incorrect.
- The draft analysis reduces the total PM Peak Hour trips using an incorrect application of internal capture. A reduction in total trips cannot be assumed for the interaction of vehicle trips between the proposed development areas north and south of Buck Lake Road.
- The Applicant has not included the new proposed movie theatre in the calculation of estimated PM peak hour trips. This is a separate land use which has not been analyzed previously, and has different trip characteristics.
- The Applicant attempts to determine the maximum proposed development scenario allowed. Results of the Applicant's proposed development's trip generation results must be compared to that of the original vested development's trip generation results (using original land use categories and sizes). This comparative information has not been provided.
- According to Leon County staff, it is our understanding that the Applicant's use of 3,659 total trips to determine a maximum development scenario is not an official number to be used for local concurrency evaluation. Furthermore, common practice involves using the "net new external trips" (for both entering and exiting traffic), not "total" trips, to compare the Applicant's proposed development with the vested development. Using the vested development scenario provided by Leon County, the attached trip generation table indicates that the maximum allowable size of commercial use should be significantly less than proposed by the Applicant by approximately 300,000 square feet.
- The Applicant's proposed changes in the amount of commercial/office square footage and residential units results in a significant difference in the enter/exit vehicle split of the overall development. Therefore, the Applicant's proposed PM peak hour trip generation table, when compared to the net new external trips for the vested development, indicates an increase in the net new external "entering" trips of about 23 percent. Therefore, the development (as proposed by the Applicant) would be subject to a local concurrency determination evaluation.
- The implication that year 2007 corresponds to the buildout year of the proposed development is not reasonable. It is more reasonable to assume the project buildout year is at least 10 years from now. This assumption affects the calculation of pass-by trips in the Applicant's PM peak hour trip generation table and will also affect the type of roadway improvements that will be required adjacent to the project site at buildout.
- Proposed roadway and intersection geometric recommendations do not demonstrate that adopted Level of Service (LOS) requirements have been satisfied for the development at project buildout.

Information

- The FDOT has not been provided with sufficient information in the DRAFT Traffic Assessment to conduct a complete review of the proposed development's traffic impacts and suggested recommendations. The following information is missing and must be provided to conduct a complete review:
 1. Trip Generation for the original vested development land uses (used to compare with the proposed development scenario)
 2. Traffic distribution map. The Applicant should consider the revised traffic patterns and distribution appropriate for the proposed increases in commercial space and reductions in the office and residential uses.
 3. Level of Service (LOS) analyses supporting the Applicant's proposed recommended geometric improvements. The analyses must demonstrate that adopted LOS standards have been satisfied based on the projected buildout year.
- Further questions or reviews may be forthcoming based upon future responses or analysis submittals provided by the Applicant.

Concluding Remarks

Regardless of the project's vesting status, the Applicant is also required to submit appropriate documentation with supporting analyses to the FDOT for obtaining driveway connection and utility permits for the proposed development. A traffic signal warrant study will be required for each traffic signal proposed by the Applicant on the state highway system. Appropriate traffic operational analyses and recommendations must be submitted for review to the FDOT, signed and sealed by a qualified professional engineer licensed in the State of Florida.

In the event that changes to the development land uses affect the project's vesting status, the FDOT will require a revised methodology statement from the Applicant, identification of a larger study area, and subsequent traffic impact study analyses for roadway links and intersections, consistent with DRI requirements.

This concludes our review of the Applicant's DRAFT traffic study at this time. Upon further review of a final analyses and documentation, the FDOT may have additional questions regarding the proposed project. If you have any questions regarding this review, please call.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Glenda Duncan".

Glenda Duncan
Planning Administrator

Attachment

copies: Tommy Barfield
Craig Gavin
Richard Barr and Dave Muntean, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
Robert Downie, General Counsel
Bryant Paulk

2015 Buildout – Modification of Applicant's Trip Generation Table (original had minor errors in equations and referenced year 2007)

Land Use #	Land Use Type	Size	Units	Formula	Total Trips		Internal Capture	Internal		Total		Pass-by		Net New External				
					Enter	Exit		Internal	Exit	Total Trips	Enter	Exit	Total Trips	Enter	Exit			
																% Internal	% Pass-by	
820	Shopping Center	848.5	KSF	$L_n(T) = 0.66 * L_n(X) + 3.4$	2,568	1,233	1,335	11.6%	298	132	166	2,270	29.7%	673	347	1,597	775	822
710	General Office (5th Ed.)	50	KSF	$L_n(T) = 0.737 * L_n(X) + 1.831$	112	19	93	25.9%	29	6	23	83	0%	0	0	83	13	70
210	Single-Family Detached Housing	757	DU	$L_n(T) = 0.90 * L_n(X) + 0.53$	663	418	245	27.9%	185	110	75	478	0%	0	0	478	308	170
210	Cluster Home	0	DU	$L_n(T) = 0.90 * L_n(X) + 0.54$	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0
230	Residential Condominium/Townhouse	757	DU	$L_n(T) = 0.82 * L_n(X) + 0.32$	316	212	104	27.9%	88	52	36	228	0%	0	0	228	160	68
220	Multifamily	0	DU	$T = 0.55 * (X) + 17.65$	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0
					3,659	1,882	1,777	16.4%	600	300	300	3,059	22.0%	673	Total	2,386	2,566	1,130

Vested Development Land Uses, Provided by Leon County

TABLE 5 FALLSCHASE DEVELOPMENT ORDER PLAN per THE COUNTY - Any Buildout Year TRIP GENERATION - PM PEAK HOUR																			
Land Use #	Land Use Type	Size	Units	Formula	Total Trips		Internal		Internal Capture		Total External		Pass-by		Pass-by		Net New		
					Enter	Exit	Internal	Trips	Internal	Enter	Internal	Trips	Total	Trips	Enter	Trips	Exit	Enter	Exit
820	Shopping Center	319.8	KSF	$L_n(T)=0.66*L_n(X)+3.4$	1,348	647	701	13.1%	176	71	105	1,172	34%	398	196	202	774	380	394
710	General Office (5th Ed.)	425	KSF	$L_n(T)=0.737*L_n(X)+1.831$	540	92	448	8.0%	43	21	22	497	0%	0	0	0	497	71	426
210	Single-Family Detached Housing	179	DU	$L_n(T)=0.90*L_n(X)+0.53$	181	114	67	13.9%	25	15	10	156	0%	0	0	0	156	99	57
230	Residential Condominium/Townhouse	2112	DU	$L_n(T)=0.82*L_n(X)+0.32$	733	491	242	13.9%	102	63	39	631	0%	0	0	0	631	428	203
220	Multifamily	280	DU	$T=0.55*(X)+17.65$	172	112	60	13.9%	24	15	9	148	0%	0	0	0	148	97	51
					2,974	1,456	1,518	12.4%	370	185	185	2,604	15%	398		Total	2,206	1,107	1,131

2015 Buildout – Maximum Allowable Commercial Using Net New External Trips

Land Use #	Land Use Type	Size	Units	Formula	Total Trips		Enter	Exit	% Internal			Internal Capture			Total External Trips			Pass-by			Net New External Trips		
					Trips	Trips			Internal	Internal	Internal	Enter	Exit	Trips	Enter	Exit	Trips	Enter	Exit	Trips	Enter	Exit	
820	Shopping Center	573	KSF	$L_n(T)=0.66*L_n(X)+3.4$	1,981	951	1,030		11.9%	235	105	130	1,746	34.0%	594	288	306	1,152	558	594			
710	General Office (5th Ed.)	50	KSF	$L_n(T)=0.737*L_n(X)+1.831$	112	19	93		24.1%	27	6	21	85	0%	0	0	0	85	13	72			
210	Single-Family Detached Housing	757	DU	$L_n(T)=0.90*L_n(X)+0.53$	663	418	245		21.7%	144	86	58	519	0%	0	0	0	519	332	187			
210	Single-Family Detached Housing	757	DU	$L_n(T)=0.90*L_n(X)+0.53$	663	418	245		21.7%	144	86	58	519	0%	0	0	0	519	332	187			
210	Cluster Home	0	DU	$L_n(T)=0.90*L_n(X)+0.54$	0	0	0		0.0%	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0			
230	Residential Condominium/Townhouse	757	DU	$L_n(T)=0.82*L_n(X)+0.32$	316	212	104		21.7%	68	40	28	248	0%	0	0	0	248	172	76			
220	Multifamily	0	DU	$T=0.55*(X)+17.65$	0	0	0		0.0%	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0			
					3,072	1,600	1,472		15.4%	474	237	237	2,598	22.9%	594	288	Total	2,004	1,075	929			

Note: Provision of the above calculations does not serve to endorse the use of 3,659 total trips as the official number for use in the concurrency evaluation.